

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Serial No. 10/717,249

Page 1 of 2

IN THE UNITED STATES

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT APPLICATION

Applicants: **Evans**

Case: **CAT/009**

Serial No.: **10/717,249**

Filed: **November 19, 2003**

Examiner: **Randy, Boyer**

Group Art Unit: **1797**

Confirmation No.: **7746**

Title: **MOBILE FLUID CATALYTIC CRACKING INJECTION SYSTEM**

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

In response to the Notice of Allowance dated December 11, 2008, please enter this statement.

REMARKS

The Examiner's statement of Reasons for Allowance include:

With respect to independent claim 1, claim 18, and claim 22 and from which respective dependent claims depend "neither Andon (US 4,082,513) nor Erickson (US 4,769,127) discloses or otherwise suggests a mobile catalyst injection system comprising, in part, a process controller and/or flow control device coupled to a transportable platform or catalyst reservoir and adapted to deliver a "metered amount" of catalyst from the catalyst reservoir to a fluid catalytic cracking unit."

With respect to independent claim 26 and from which respective dependent claims, "neither Andon nor Erickson explicitly discloses or otherwise suggests a method for process control in a fluid catalytic cracking system comprising, in part, injecting a "metered amount" of catalyst from a mobile catalyst injection system into a fluid catalytic cracking unit."

Applicant objects to the Examiner's statement of Reasons for Allowance as follows.

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. §104e. In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. While applicant believes that the claims are allowable, Applicant does not acquiesce that patentability resides in each feature, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

Dec. 12, 2008

Tanzina Chowdhury
Tanzina Chowdhury
Attorney Reg. No. 46,624
Intercat, Inc.
Manasquan, NJ 08736
(732) 292-5042

If